

5-1-1959

# A Study of Paul's Interpretation of the Old Testament with Particular Reference to His Use of Isaiah in the Letter to the Romans

James A. Field

---

## Recommended Citation

Field, James A., "A Study of Paul's Interpretation of the Old Testament with Particular Reference to His Use of Isaiah in the Letter to the Romans" (1959). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 352.  
[https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes\\_theses/352](https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/352)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact [arolf@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolf@georgefox.edu).

APPROVED BY

Major Professor: Midred Wynkoop

Co-operative Reader: Kenneth P. Wesche

Professor of Thesis Form: M. Wynkoop

A STUDY OF PAUL'S INTERPRETATION OF THE  
OLD TESTAMENT WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE  
TO HIS USE OF ISAIAH IN THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS

by

James A. Field

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the

Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

of the requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Divinity

Portland 22, Oregon

May, 1959

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
A. Statement of the Problem. . . . .	1
B. Statement of the Purpose. . . . .	4
C. Justification for the Study . . . . .	4
D. Limitations of the Study. . . . .	5
E. Statement of Procedure. . . . .	6
II. HISTORICAL SURVEY OF LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. . . . .	7
A. General Sources . . . . .	8
B. Special Sources . . . . .	11
III. NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE SEPTUAGINT . . . . .	19
IV. EXEGETICAL METHODS CONTEMPORARY WITH THE APOSTLE PAUL. . . . .	29
A. Palestinian Exegesis. . . . .	30
B. Alexandrian Exegesis. . . . .	34
C. Apocalyptic Exegesis. . . . .	35
V. PAUL'S USE OF ISAIAH IN THE BOOK OF ROMANS. . . . .	37
A. Romans 2:24 . . . . .	40
B. Romans 3:15-17. . . . .	44
C. Romans 4:25 . . . . .	45
D. Romans 8:33, 34 . . . . .	46



E. Romans 9:20 . . . . .	47
F. Romans 9:27-29. . . . .	51
G. Romans 9:32, 33 . . . . .	54
H. Romans 10:11. . . . .	57
I. Romans 10:15, 16. . . . .	58
J. Romans 10:20, 21. . . . .	62
K. Romans 11:8 . . . . .	65
L. Romans 11:34. . . . .	67
M. Romans 11:26, 27. . . . .	69
N. Romans 11:11. . . . .	70
O. Romans 15:12. . . . .	72
P. Romans 15:21. . . . .	74
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	76
Summary . . . . .	77
Conclusions . . . . .	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	85

## I. INTRODUCTION

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Statement Of The Problem

One of the most obvious characteristics of the New Testament which greets the eyes of even the casual reader is its great dependence upon the Old Testament. Words, phrases, topics, personalities, and events from the Old Testament are carried forward into the New on almost every one of its pages. It has often been stated that neither of the Testaments can be understood apart from the other. Centuries ago Augustine declared that, "The New Testament lies hidden in the Old, and the Old is made plain in the New."<sup>1</sup>

The dependence of the New Testament upon the Old is especially seen in the many times it quotes from the Old. Estimates run around two-hundred direct and recognizable quotations with hundreds more indirect quotations and allusions. The book of Isaiah is directly quoted about sixty times and indirectly referred to about 150 times in the New Testament.<sup>2</sup>

The first problem is that of listing all of the places where the New Testament uses the Old and of classifying them according to their degree of directness. As one reads more closely and attempts to compare the quotations with their sources, other problems become apparent. On

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Based on the lists given by Toy, Swete, Nestle and Ellis.

the word level the first group of problems are seen. Why didn't the New Testament writers quote the Old Testament with a greater degree of verbal accuracy? Then as the comparison is pressed, questions are raised as to whether the authors of the New Testament really understood the Old or not. Some times they seem to completely ignore the context of the original passage and interpret it to suit their own purposes. Concerning this Olaf Moe asks:

"But is not this spiritual interpretation as we meet it in the Apostle--if judged from a viewpoint of scientific exposition--a wholly arbitrary matter? Is it not simply a relic of an antiquated Jewish method of interpretation? If we consider the Apostle's use of single passages of Scripture, it seems that he has torn them out of their context and has built his interpretations upon the words themselves, ignoring historical backgrounds and the limitations they impose, and putting into words themselves the whole fullness of New Testament content."<sup>1</sup>

The questions that Moe asks raise still a third area of difficulty, that of the relation between Paul's method of interpreting Scripture and that used by the rabbis of Paul's day. Some say that Paul used the Scripture in exactly the same way that the rabbis used it. Commenting on Paul's use of Isaiah 52:7 and 53:1 in Romans 10:15, 16, John Knox states that,

"Such a way of interpreting scripture may be, according to our standards, faulty to the point of being absurd, but it conforms to typical rabbinical exegesis in Paul's time. . ."<sup>2</sup>

Also in line with this series of problems which is found in the comparison of the New Testament quotations with their sources is the

---

<sup>1</sup>Olaf Moe, The Apostle Paul: His Message and Doctrine, trans. by L. A. Vigness (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1954), p. 74.

<sup>2</sup>John Knox, "Romans", The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), p. 563.

question of authority. What is to be the authority as to what constitutes a valid interpretation of an Old Testament passage? Are we to accept the rabbinical approach, the interpretations of Jesus and his followers, or one of the various schools of interpretation which have evolved since the time of Christ? Just what can be accepted as a sound basis of interpretation for one who wishes to correctly understand and interpret the Old Testament?

Closely connected to this examination of the New Testament attitude towards the Old Testament is the problem of inspiration which verbal differences between the Testaments raise. To some theories verbal exactness is an imperative upon which the whole structure either stands or falls. What view of inspiration did the New Testament writers hold of the Old Testament records?

#### B. Statement Of The Purpose

In the studies in this thesis each of these problem areas is discussed with a view of finding principles which will give guidance in interpreting the Old Testament theologically. The main objective of this thesis is to derive New Testament principles of Old Testament interpretation which may be used in doctrinal preaching today.

#### C. Justification For The Study

This study had its origin in a personal problem which faced the author in his college days. He was taught that the Old Testament was proven to be true by the fulfillment of its prophecies in the New Testament. Some of these passages were compared and found to be in

apparent disagreement; the Old Testament passage was worded in one way and the New Testament passage in another. Coupled with this anomaly was the seeming misuse of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers. How could this be understood and defended, or could it?

The author went to commentaries to receive help in solving these problems, but another difficulty arose. The commentators had many ideas, often conflicting, of the manner in which the New Testament authors considered and used the Old Testament Scriptures. There did not seem to be any basic set of presuppositions to which the reader could refer. It is in this lack of an objective basis for understanding the New Testament use of the Old that this thesis finds its justification. Some clear statement of the philosophy behind the usage of the Old Testament is needed for those who today want to know how to use and understand the Old Testament.

#### D. Limitations Of The Study

Paul's use of the writings of the prophet Isaiah in the book of Romans has been chosen as the specific area of research to which this thesis is addressed. This is part of the larger problem area which includes the hundreds of New Testament references to the Old Testament in the New Testament books. Isaiah is quoted from more than any other Old Testament book except the Psalms and is the product of only one author rather than several as is the Psalms. Thus the quotations from Isaiah form a very substantial segment of the New Testament use of the Old Testament.

Paul uses Isaiah in Romans more than in any other book of the New Testament. Also, Romans is largely a doctrinal treatise. Since it was within the purpose of this thesis to examine the doctrinal use of the Old Testament by the New, Romans was chosen. Thus the study of the New Testament use of the Old Testament was limited to Paul's use of Isaiah in the book of Romans. It was felt that this would be representative of the whole New Testament use of the Old Testament.

#### E. Statement Of Procedure

The problem of the way in which the New Testament authors quoted from the Old Testament books was developed in the following manner. First, a brief historical sketch of the major works dealing with the subject was given. These are in the main confined to works in the English language. Included in this chapter was a discussion of the writings of Franklin Johnson. He was used to provide a background of solid and evangelical scholarship against which this study was conducted. After this the Septuagint Version was studied and Paul's use of it evaluated. The next chapter described the various exegetical methods which were contemporary with Paul and the other New Testament writers. Their influence upon Paul, if any, was discussed.

After this background was built, the actual usage by Paul of the Old Testament was presented. His quotations of the prophet Isaiah were listed and discussed with the goal of uncovering his basic ideas regarding the interpretation of the Old Testament and their relevance for today.



II. HISTORICAL SURVEY OF LITERATURE ON THE  
NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

## II. HISTORICAL SURVEY OF LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Along with the Reformation and its emphasis on the Bible came a renewed interest in Biblical studies. One of the new areas of interest was that of the New Testament quotations of the Old Testament. Out of this interest came the first systematic treatment of the subject. It was a listing of the New Testament quotations in Robert Stephen's Greek Testament which was published in Paris in 1550. The following century saw much basic groundwork firmly laid for future research in this problem area. The issues then discussed, textual variations, affinities with rabbinic methods, and the propriety of New Testament exegesis, have strangely remained in the foreground to this day. Present day scholarship is concerned with these basic problems just as much as these earlier writers were.

The following list of works on this subject of the New Testament usage of the Old Testament is not complete, nor does it try to be. It is a summary of the most important literature on the subject which has been produced since the Reformation. It emphasizes especially the works which have been written in the English language and which have been written within the last one hundred and fifty years.

### A. General Sources

J. Drusii, 'Notae in Parallelis Sacra', Tractatum Biblicorum, Volumen Prius, sive Criticorum Sacrorum, Tomus VIII, Londini, 1660.

This was a series of critical note on the quotations from the Old Testament.

G. Surenhusio (Surenhusius) published a work in 1713 which especially dealt with the introductory formulae, merged quotations, and the practice of quoting from the Law, Prophets, and the Hagiographa in succession. His most important contribution to the study was his demonstration of the extensive agreement in methodology between the New Testament writers and the Jewish rabbis.

W. Whiston, An Essay towards Restoring the True Text of the Old Testament, London, 1722. His thesis was that the New Testament accurately quoted the first century Greek manuscripts but that they were in themselves corrupt. He thought that the Jews had somehow perverted these Scriptures, so he went to the Samaritan Pentateuch, Philo, and Josephus to correct the Hebrew Bible.

T. Sherlock, The Use and Intent of Prophecy, London, 1726.

J. G. Carpsov, A Defense of the Hebrew Bible, London, 1729.

Carpsov disagreed with Whiston and argued that the Hebrew text was accurate and that the disagreements came as a result of the hermeneutical purposes and literary convenience of the New Testament authors.

T. Randolph, The Prophecies and Other Texts Cited in the New Testament, Oxford, 1782. He found that 120 quotations followed the Hebrew and 119 the Septuagint. The New Testament authors were mainly in agreement with the Hebrew.

H. Owen, The Modes of Quotation Used by the Evangelical Writers, London, 1789. He contended with Randolph that the majority of the New Testament citations were taken from the Greek and not the Hebrew. He

was particularly interested in the objections of the Jews and other infidels who pointed to the differences between the New Testament quotation and its Old Testament source.

L. Woods, The Objection to the Inspiration of the Evangelists and Apostles from Their Manner of Quoting Texts from the Old Testament, Andover, 1824.

J. G. C. Dopke, Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller, Leipzig, 1829. Followed upon the work done by Surenhusius and developed it. Accuses the New Testament writers of using rabbinical methods and principles of interpretation.

F. A. C. Tholuck, The Old Testament in the New, translated in the July 1854 issue of Bibliotheca Sacra.

D. M. Turpie, The Old Testament in the New, London, 1868 and The New Testament View of the Old, London, 1872. Turpie tried to defend the use of the Old Testament by the writers of the New and made an extensive study of the introductory formulae used by the New Testament writers and tried to show their varying significances.

C. Taylor, The Gospel in the Law, Cambridge, 1869.

E. Bohl, Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel, Wien, 1873. He sought to resist the trend towards regarding the New Testament quotations as being mainly from the Alexandrian version by suggesting that an Aramaic Volksbibel was current in the time of Christ which was almost identical to the Septuagint.

J. Scott, Principles of New Testament Quotation, Edinburgh, 1887.

C. H. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament, New York, 1884. Like Turpie, Toy gives a commentary on each of the quotations, but he differs

in that he takes a much more critical view. His work is one of the standard reference books on this subject today.

Frederic Gardiner, The Old and New Testaments in Their Mutual Relations, New York, James Pott & Co., Publishers, 1887.

H. B. Swete, Introduction to the Greek Old Testament, Cambridge, 1895. Though this work does not deal primarily with this problem of quotations, it does provide a clearer understanding of the background of the Septuagint version or versions from which most of the New Testament quotations are taken. Swete himself produced the Cambridge edition of Septuagint which is a very widely used reference work.

T. W. Manson, "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus", Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 1952.

J. W. Wenham, Our Lord's View of the Old Testament, London, 1953.

R. V. G. Tasker, The Old Testament in the New Testament, London, 1954.<sup>1</sup>

## B. Special Sources

Early. Among the many commentaries which came out of the first two centuries following the Reformation, the following were used because of their interest in New Testament quotations.

John Calvin, (1509-1564) a Roman Catholic priest who was converted to Protestantism in 1533, was well trained in Greek and Hebrew as well as law. His theological views which today are accepted by the majority

---

<sup>1</sup>The material in this section is based on the historical sketch given by Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 2-5.

of Protestants were first published in 1536 and later revised several times. He wrote commentaries on almost all of the books of the Bible, and these commentaries are considered today by many to be a very valuable resource in understanding the Scriptures. In his commentaries he usually gives the New Testament quotations of the Old considerable space and attention. His presupposition is that there is an essential harmony between the two Testaments and that the New Testament authors found and expressed the real meaning of the Old Testament authors.

Adam Clarke (1762-1832) was a Methodist preacher, theologian, and commentator as well as a leader in the area of foreign missions. He was the President of the British Conference of Methods three times. His chief area of intellectual interest was in the field of Orientology in which he has been widely recognized as an authority. His commentaries of the Scriptures are still of much value because of the wealth of information he included from his studies of the Orient. In Volume five, page 48, he goes into some detail on the way the New Testament uses the Old.

Herman Olshausen (1796-1839) was primarily a New Testament exegete who preferred the allegorical and typical methods of exegesis although he recognized the grammatical and historical elements. His commentaries give much space to the New Testament quotations from the Old. He tends to look at the New Testament usage as primarily typical.

Nineteenth Century. During this century many scholars worked on the problems of the New Testament quotations, and many books on the subject were published. Also many commentaries were written whose authors commented on the quotations. The following list contains those which were of particular value for this thesis.

Joseph Addison Alexander (1809-1860) was an American Presbyterian who graduated from Princeton and later returned to teach in the area of Oriental and Biblical literature. His main distinction was in the area of linguistics in which he had remarkable skills. He is especially known for his commentary on Isaiah which stood as a bold witness for its unity in an age when it was popular to consider it otherwise.

Dean Henry Alford (1810-1871) graduated from Cambridge and was the Dean of Canterbury for many years. His most famous work was his four volume Greek Testament which was later accommodated to the English student in his New Testament for English Readers which was also published in four volumes. It is from the latter work that this thesis has drawn some of its material.

Frederic Louis Godet (1812-1900) was a Swiss Reformer who taught at the Theological Academy of the Free Church at Neuchatel. His major areas were New Testament exegesis and critical theology. His commentaries on the New Testament are often referred to and display many times a very deep insight into the Scriptures.

Franz Delitzsch (1813-1890) was born of Hebrew parents in Germany and was very active in his adult years in the conversion of the Jews. He collaborated with Keil on what is generally considered to be one of the best Old Testament commentaries of the Nineteenth Century. His views in later life were influenced some by Wellhausen, Cheyne, and Driver, yet he held strongly to the Bible as a divine revelation and fully inspired. His volumes on Isaiah are a monument of Old Testament scholarship of that period from a conservative viewpoint.



Franklin Johnson (1836-19?) was a Baptist and served as president of Ottawa University from 1890 to 1892 and was then professor of church history and homiletics at the University of Chicago. Of his many books one written during his middle years has found to be of much value and assistance in writing this thesis. This book is The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896).

Johnson lists the principle difficulties which have been found with the quotations of the New Testament from the Old as follows:

1. The writers of the New Testament, instead of translating their quotations directly from the Hebrew, use the Septuagint version, which is not free from faults.
2. Their quotations from the Septuagint are often verbally inexact, and their variations from this version are seldom of the nature of corrections, since they seem usually to have quoted from memory.
3. They sometimes employ quotations so brief and fragmentary that the reader cannot readily determine the degree of support, if any, which the quotation gives to the argument.
4. They sometimes alter the language of the Old Testament with the obvious design of aiding their argument.
5. They sometimes present in the form of a single quotation an assemblage of phrases or sentences drawn from different sources.
6. In a few instances they give us, apparently as quotations from the Old Testament, sentences which it does not contain.
7. They regard some historical passages of the Old Testament as allegories, and thus draw from them inferences of which the original writers knew nothing.
8. They often 'quote by sound, without regard to the sense.'
9. They habitually treat as relating to the Messiah and his kingdom passages written with reference to persons who lived and events which happened centuries before the Christian era.
10. When they understand the passage which they quote, they often argue from it in an inconclusive and illogical manner, so that the evidence which they adduce does not prove the statement which they seek to support by means of it.

11. They deal with the Old Testament after the manner of the rabbis of their time, which was uncritical and erroneous, rather than as men inspired by the Holy Spirit to perceive and express the exact truth.<sup>1</sup>

These then are the main issues which he addresses himself to in his book. It might be mentioned that these objections are very similar to the ones offered by Kuenen, in fact, much of Johnson's book is a refutation of Kuenen's work on The Prophet and Prophecy in Israel in which the New Testament writers come under heavy criticism for their use of the Greek Old Testament.

Franklin Johnson's thesis holds a rather unique place among the many attempts to find a way through to a solution of the problems in New Testament quotations. He states,

. . .I think it just to regard the writers of the Bible as the creators of a great literature. They have produced all the chief forms of literature, as history, biography, anecdote, proverb, oratory, allegory, poetry, and fiction. They have needed, therefore, all the resources of human speech, its sobriety and scientific precision on one page, its rainbow hues of fancy and imagination on another, its fires of passion on yet another. They could not have moved and guided men in the best manner had they denied themselves the utmost force and freedom of language; had they refused to employ its wide range of expressions, whether exact or poetic; had they not borrowed without stint its many forms of reason, of terror, of rapture, of hope, of joy, of peace. So also, they have needed the usual freedom of literary allusion and citation, in order to commend the gospel to the judgment, the taste, and the feelings of their readers. Bearing all this in memory, I shall inquire whether in their quotations from the Old Testament the writers of the New have disregarded the laws of literature.<sup>2</sup>

In examining the literature of the New Testament Johnson finds two kinds of laws governing literary expression. First, there are those

---

<sup>1</sup> Franklin Johnson, The Quotations of the New Testament From the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896), pp. ix, x.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. x, xi.

which belong to all literatures of all ages and nations, like that of truth, or that of beauty. Second, there are those which change with season, and clime, the dictates of evanescent or local taste and custom, such as the absence of rhyme from ancient poetry, the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, or the alliteration of English poetry.

Johnson's approach is to take each of the problem areas listed above and to examine them in light of the common usage in what he considers great literature beginning with the Greek poets and philosophers, continuing into the Latin writers, and then into modern English authors and poets. In each group he looks for evidence of the working of the two kinds of laws he has described, especially the first, and then tries to show that the New Testament authors were not provincial in their literary methods but actually followed along in the line of best tradition within all great literature.

In the main Johnson's approach was found to be very helpful in finding a way through the maze of problems and suggested answers. It was shown in a rather convincing way that the writers of the New Testament are reliable and not deceitful nor ignorant in their use of the Old Testament. Johnson's approaching this through general literature gives more weight to the approaches based on certain theological presuppositions and on inductive studies of the occurrences of quotations in the New Testament. No one approach is enough, although the latter is the most emphasized. This writer feels that the perspective given by Johnson is much needed and helps to place the problem in its proper setting.

Joseph Agar Beet (1840-19?) was professor of systematic theology at Wesleyan College and professor of theology at the University of London. His views have at times been criticized because he showed at least some degree of sympathy with the modern school of criticism yet this was at a time when most conservatives could not see that any good could come out of Biblical criticism. His views are clearly orthodox except perhaps for some of his eschatological concepts. His treatment of the New Testament usage of the Old was very conservative and many times gave good direction to this writer.

Recent. Not very much attention to the problem of New Testament quotations has been given in recent years. The recent commentators seemingly pass over it and books on the subject are scarce. The following is a list of the books which contained information relevant to the thesis problem area.

William G. Williams was professor of Greek at Ohio Wesleyan University around the turn of the century. He wrote from a thoroughly conservative viewpoint. His commentary on Romans was of much value in a couple of places and provided part of the basis for some important conclusions.

William Sanday (1843-1920) was a professor of divinity and canon at Oxford and a minister of the Church of England. He gave the Bampton Lecture for 1893 on the theme of inspiration. His literary efforts include over twenty books of his own and contributions to Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible. Professor Sanday collaborated with Arthur Cagley Headlam (1862-1945), also of the Church of England and Oxford, to write a commentary on Romans for the International Critical Commentary

series. This volume was used extensively because of its detailed considerations of the New Testament quotations from the Old Testament. The authors gave much attention to the part the Septuagint Versions played in Paul's usage of the Old Testament. Sometimes their comments were quite critical of Paul, but in the majority of cases consulted they had made constructive additions to the subject.

John Knox (born 1900) has taught at Emory University, Hartford Theological Seminary, University of Chicago, and Union Theological Seminary. His exegesis of Romans for the Interpreter's Bible was consulted many times for his views which were very definitely critical and considered Paul to be a slave to rabbinical methods of interpretation. The comments he made were valuable in pointing out the problem areas and in locating Septuagint relationships.

E. Earle Ellis, a graduate of Faith Seminary and Wheaton Graduate School, has added the most recent (1957) work to the long list on this subject. His study is not primarily a textual study as many of the preceding but is rather a seeking of the rationale which underlies the Pauline usage of the Old Testament. He claims that Paul's knowledge of Christ opened up the Old Testament that its true meaning could be seen. Ellis examines the hermeneutical questions which are raised by textual variations and New Testament applications and analyses Paul's place among the various contemporary schools of interpretation among the Jews which existed in Paul's day. He does not believe that Paul used the forced methods of the rabbis of his day. Ellis makes contributions from time to time to the Journal of Biblical Literature, New Testament Studies, and The Evangelical Quarterly.

### III. NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

### III. NEW TESTAMENT USE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

In tracing out the language of the text of the Bible which the various New Testament writers used, it is generally conceded that the Septuagint is the main source. Practically any source which deals with the problem will attribute most of the New Testament quotations and allusions to the Greek Old Testament. Turpie says that 33% of the quotations are directly from the Septuagint and unaltered, 36% depart somewhat from it, 28% have been latered to a less accordance with the Hebrew, and that only 1% have been altered to a closer accordance with the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> Johnson says,

"The quotations of the New Testament from the Old are not usually exact translations of the Hebrew; the majority of them are drawn from the Greek version called the Septuagint, and follow this where it agrees with the original, and also where it departs from it."<sup>2</sup>

H. B. Swete is certain that more than half of the Pauline quotations were taken from the Septuagint without any material change and that that version "is the principal source from which the writers of the New Testament derived their Old Testament quotations."<sup>3</sup> This agreement

---

<sup>1</sup>Turpie, quoted in Johnson, The Quotations of the New Testament From the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Henry Barclay Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1902), pp. 392, 400 ff.



can be traced back many years; Ellis refers to Henry Owen who wrote in 1789 as believing that the New Testament writers used the Septuagint Version primarily.<sup>1</sup>

In commenting on the magnitude of the influence of the Septuagint on the New Testament, H. B. Swete makes the following comments,

"It is not too much to say that in its literary form and expression the New Testament would have been a widely different book had it been written by authors who knew it in a Greek version other than that of the LXX."<sup>2</sup>

Approaching it from a slightly different angle, Johnson gives an idea of the importance of the Septuagint to the people of the first century.

"The world of the apostolic age was much more dependent upon the Septuagint, its one written version, and upon such oral versions as the rabbis might make in the synagogues, than we are upon our modern versions."<sup>3</sup>

Once establishing the use of the Greek Old Testament by the New Testament authors, the question may be asked, "Why did they use it?" Why did these men go ahead and use a version which seems to be full of errors and misinterpretations and apparently departs largely from any Hebrew text of which we have any record? Why did they seem to quote these apparent errors and give them their sanction?

One answer which is offered is that it was the version which was in common use and therefore provided a commonly accepted means of communication.

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), p. 12.

<sup>2</sup>Swete, op. cit., p. 404.

<sup>3</sup>Johnson, op. cit., p. 19.

"The New Testament was not written for a limited number of learned men; but for the great world, and for the churches gathered out of it, and thus for people of ordinary intelligence. In quoting from the Septuagint, its writers did as all religious writers of all ages have done, in so far as they have addressed the people not technically learned; they quoted from the version which their readers know."<sup>1</sup>

It is only natural that the writer in German, for example, should use the common German version as translated by Luther, or that a missionary to Burma would use the translation of Judson. It is the common thing for a writer to refer to the common version of the group to which he is writing.

The New Testament authors are severely criticized for their use of an imperfect text. Kuonen feels that these men were obligated to correct the Septuagint whenever it was in error and to tell their readers that such corrections had been made. He even goes to the point of saying that corrections should be made when the faults of the Septuagint do not in any way affect the argument of the New Testament authors.<sup>2</sup>

This argument has been partly met by stating that the Septuagint was the only written version of that day. The Hebrew as a language was dead except among the learned rabbis and there exists some doubt as to just how much of a critical knowledge of it still remained with them. The other part of the answer lies in investigating the claim that the New Testament authors took advantage of the errors of the Septuagint Version to promote their own doctrines. This is handled in larger detail

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

further on in this paper when Paul's use of Isaiah in the epistle of Romans is studied. Each of the instances where Paul clearly quotes from or alludes to Isaiah is analyzed to see if the Old Testament was justly handled and to see just what forms of hermeneutic Paul used in interpreting the Old Testament.

Many men have rallied in support of the New Testament authors and of their careful use of the Septuagint Version. Tholuck is quoted as saying that,

"It is a remarkable fact that, although all the authors of the New Testament seem to have used the Septuagint translation, yet where that translation--at least as it lies before us--wholly wanders away from the sense of the original, or becomes entirely destitute of meaning, they either resort to another translation, or themselves translate the text independently. We do not recall a single place, either in the Gospels or in the epistles of Paul, where a text of the Old Testament, as to its essential contents, has been disguised by the use of the Septuagint version."<sup>1</sup>

In comparing the procedure of the New Testament writers with that of other authors in general, Johnson asserts that,

"Thus the writers of the New Testament dealt with the inaccuracies of the common version of their time much as the conscientious theologian of today deals with those of the versions most accessible to the people. The theologian in quoting from either of the well-known English versions, does not reject any text which he wishes to use because its language seems to him less exact than some other form of words, if the divine thought is preserved in its integrity. Nay further, when he finds in it some slight inaccuracy of meaning, if this has nothing to do with his argument, he takes the passage as it is, and refrains from adverse comment lest he enfeeble his production by endless and unprofitable digressions. If, however, the inaccuracy stands in his way, he removes it, and brings out the full light of the truth which it obscured or concealed; and, on the other hand, if it is of a nature to favor his cause unduly, he refuses to avail himself of it. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 27,28.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 19,20.

Whether the judgment of these men and others who accept the same standpoint is justified or not can only be determined by a close examination of the New Testament use of the Old. This is done through the examination of Paul's use of Isaiah in Romans later in this thesis.

In past years there has been quite a concentrated search for the original form of the Septuagint. It has been felt that if the various text-forms which have come down to this day are compared a basic text may be derived. The procedure has been much the same as that followed by New Testament scholars such as Westcott and Hort and Nestle. This effort has been grounded upon the assumption that there existed an "ur-Septuagint" comparing with the New Testament autographs.<sup>1</sup>

This thesis is behind the efforts of Alfred Rahlfs in the compiling of his two volume set, Septuaginta, which is the most modern of the main versions commonly used.<sup>2</sup> However, even though sanctioned by such scholarship, this concept of Septuagint origin is now questioned. Paul's quotations show considerable distribution among the Septuagint text-forms with none of them being consistently followed. "A" is followed more closely than any other, yet "B" and "F" are referred to many times.<sup>3</sup> It was mentioned earlier that not all of the New Testament quotations follow any copy of the Septuagint which is now available. All of this has led various scholars to try to account for the differences. Some of the main theories are: 1) a direct use of the Hebrew, 2) citation from an Aramaic Targum, either written or oral, 3) free quotations from

---

<sup>1</sup>Ellis, op. cit., p. 16.    <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 16.    <sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

memory, or 4) the use of other Greek translations.<sup>1</sup>

Suspicion is now great concerning the "Letter of Aristeeas," which was for so long time generally accepted as being in the main reliable in its essentials although recognized to have some legendary accretions.<sup>2</sup> Its main teaching is that in the third century B. C. some seventy-two Jewish scholars assembled in Alexandria at the request of one of the Ptolemys and translated the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek for the great library in Alexandria. This then supports the idea that there is an archetype behind the major recensions now available (Hesychius, Lucian, Origen).

Paul Kahle is the one who has challenged this time-honored theory of Septuagint origins and has said that the "Letter of Aristeeas" is nothing more than a "late second century B. C. propaganda piece designed to promote and standardise a recent Alexandrian revision of a Greek Torah."<sup>3</sup> The Church has been on the wrong track for these many centuries. The explanation of the Greek Bible should be sought in a manner similar to that behind the Aramaic Targums. These started out as oral renderings which differed from synagogue to synagogue. Eventually they were reduced to writing and an official Targum emerged. The Targums arose because the Jews needed to hear their Scriptures in their own language, whether Aramaic or Greek. Thus in this way the Greek Bible began and developed according to Kahle. With this view Manson is in essential agreement as he states that much which now exists "is the debris of a primitive di-

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 14.    <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 16.    <sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

versity only very imperfectly overcome rather than the record of sporadic lapses from a primitive uniformity."<sup>1</sup>

This view of Septuagint origins and of the "Letter of Aristeas" is not accepted by all. In fact, Stendahl opposes it vigorously,<sup>2</sup> and Ellis finds it a little too summary in its dismissal of the "Letter of Aristeas" as being wholly too presumptuous.<sup>3</sup> Ellis regards Swete's evaluation of the letter to carry much weight, even if it is granted that the letter is a later production and was created for propaganda purposes. Also there is no extant tradition of Greek targumic materials to support Kahle's suggested parallel of development. Furthermore, a scholar who was much closer to the time of origin than the scholars of today, Philo, accepted the tradition as trustworthy.

Thus, the text behind Paul's quotations is not easily ascertained. One thing is certain, and that is that much of Paul's usage agrees with the Alexandrian version of the Septuagint (A).<sup>4</sup> That Paul was fluent in Aramaic and Hebrew would allow his use of sources written in those languages. Even a scholar of Sanday's ability was not able to always solve the problem and several times was forced to say,

"There is not sufficient evidence to say whether this variation arises from a reminiscence of the Hebrew text. . . or from an Aramaic Targum, or from the use of an earlier form of LXX text."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>5</sup>W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: 1895), p. 302.

From this point in this thesis when the word "Septuagint" is used two things should be kept in mind. One, it is assumed that the reader will be aware of the concept just presented that no single autograph of the Septuagint may exist. Rather there seems to be families of Septuagint origins. Second, when the term "Septuagint" is used to describe the source of a New Testament quotation, it refers not to a single manuscript or form but rather to one of the major recessions or versions which have come down to the present and form the basis of the modern editions of the Septuagint.

In concluding this section a comment by Johnson adds an interesting note. While discussing the observation that the New Testament authors used a text which contained and they themselves did not always quote with verbal exactness, he mentions some of the serious disadvantages which might have resulted if they had quoted with verbal exactness. They are: 1) "Their example would have been cited as irrefutable proof of verbal and mechanical, instead of dynamic inspiration." 2) "Such careful adherence to the letter of the Greek version would have been regarded as a divine seal set upon this version" thus causing it to be accepted as the final authority just as the Latin Vulgate was. In fact, Jerome faced much this same type of problem when he attempted to go back to the Hebrew in making his translation of the Old Testament. 3) As time went by many of the blemishes and imperfections of the Septuagint would have been uncovered and unbelievers would have been given an opportunity to criticize the New Testament writers for holding to an erroneous doctrine of inspiration and for ignorance of the faults of the Greek version. He concludes, then, by saying that, "These writers



were wise, therefore, in quoting as they did, with primary reference to the meaning, and with a certain disregard of the language."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnson, op. cit., pp. 60,61.

IV. EXEGETICAL METHODS CONTEMPORARY

WITH THE APOSTLE PAUL .

#### IV. EXEGETICAL METHODS CONTEMPORARY

##### WITH THE APOSTLE PAUL

The charge has already been mentioned that the New Testament authors were addicted to the uncritical, unhistorical, and erroneous principles of interpretation which the rabbis of their time followed. In order to determine the degree of correctness of this view, a survey of the methods and results of the rabbinical heremeneutics is made in this section. The goal is to gain a feeling for the spirit of their interpretations, so that a comparison may be made with the hermeneutic of Paul in the section which follows on Paul's use of Isaiah in the epistle to the Romans.

In most discussions of Jewish exegesis two trends are distinguished, the Palestinian and the Alexandrian, the literal and the allegorical. Ellis adds a third which has just recently been recognized through the findings of the Qumran Society.<sup>1</sup> This is the apocalyptic tradition which existed during the inter-testamental period and on through into the time of the early church. More is said of this last trend later in this chapter.

##### A. Palestinian Exegesis

Jewish literalism centered in the Jerusalem area and looks back to Ezra as the founder of its tradition. Underlying their interpre-

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 43-45.

tation of the Bible was "a profound respect for the Bible as the infallible Word of God."<sup>1</sup> This was carried to the point where even the letters were regarded as holy, and copyists counted each one of them in order that none would be lost in transcription. The literal sense of the Scripture was technically called the poshat while its exposition of exegesis was called the midrash. The midrash had the main purpose of investigating and elucidating by any and all exegetical methods available all the possible hidden meanings and applications of Scripture. The midrash fell into two broad forms, the halakhah and the haggadah. The halakhah dealt with the legal parts of the Scripture, mainly the Pentateuch, and considered the matters of binding law in a strict legalistic sense. These comments were mainly exegetical. The more illustrative and homiletical haggadah covered the non-legal portions of Scripture and were more free and edifying.

The oldest norms of rabbinic interpretation are found in the seven rules of Hillel, who was one of the greatest interpreters of the Jews.<sup>2</sup> Farrar describes them as follows:

"He introduced order and system into a chaotic confusion, and he devised a method by which the results of tradition could at least in appearance, be deduced from the data of the Written Law. The gigantic edifice of the Talmud really rests on the hermeneutic rules of Hillel as upon its most solid base."

"At first sight they wear an aspect of the most innocent simplicity. The first of them, known as the rule of 'light and heavy,' is simply an application of the ordinary argument, 'from less to

---

<sup>1</sup>Louis Berkhof, Principles of Biblical Interpretation (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1952), p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>Ellis, op. cit., p. 41.

greater.' The second, the rule of 'equivalence,' infers a relation between two subjects from the occurrence of identical expressions. . . . The third rule was 'extension from the special to the general.' . . . The fourth rule was the explanation of two passages by a third. The fifth rule was inference from general to special cases. The sixth was explanation from the analogy of other passages. The seventh was the application of inferences which were self-evident . . . And yet in the hands of a casuist these harmless-looking principles might be used, and were used, to give plausibility to the most unwarrantable conclusions."<sup>1</sup>

These rules of Hillel were enlarged into thirteen by Isamel and into thirty-two by Eliezar.<sup>2</sup> They contained some very good principles, such as paying close attention to grammatical forms, trying to understand the context, and the comparison of Scriptures dealing with the same topics. Two weaknesses, however, undid much of the good accomplished by the formulation of these principles of interpretation. The first was that the rabbis did not follow them closely but wandered afar off.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, the development of a hyperliteralism or a letterism undermined the good portions of Jewish exegesis. Accidentals were majored upon and essentials were overlooked. This development was based upon the concept that since God had given the Scriptures to man therefore nothing was superfluous in them, even the jots and titles.<sup>4</sup>

Some examples will show what has been above described. Over three-hundred decisions concerning Egyptian cucumbers were deduced from

---

<sup>1</sup>Frederic W. Farrar, History of Interpretation (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1886), pp. 18-20.

<sup>2</sup>Bernard S. Ramm, Protestant Biblical Interpretation (Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1950, rev. ed., 1956), p. 46.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

the Holy Writings.<sup>1</sup> Another example would be the oft mentioned equating the strength of Eliezer, Abraham's servant, with Abraham's three-hundred and eighteen servants because the numerical value of the letters in Eliezer equalled three-hundred and eighteen.<sup>2</sup> It was believed that no Israelite could suffer in Gehenna because the gold plate on the altar resisted fire, thus how much more a transgressor in Israel.<sup>3</sup> These examples give a bit of the pettyness and superfluousness of the rabbinical exegesis. There was a morbid and consuming interest in the minutiae of Scripture and a virtual overlooking of the great spiritual meanings intended by the Holy Spirit.

Rabbinical exegesis continued to stress the literal increasingly. When the Temple was destroyed in 70 A. D., Akiba popularised a method which even carried the letterism to its extremes.<sup>4</sup> The principles of gematria, notariken, and themoura were already in existence but were pressed to their utmost limit. Each letter had a numerical value, therefore words of equal numerical value could be substituted regardless of sense and context. Letters within a word could be rearranged thus forming new words. And finally, words could be commutated to correspond to secret meanings.

---

<sup>1</sup>Bernard S. Ramm, Protestant Biblical Interpretation (Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1950), p. 28.

<sup>2</sup>Milton S. Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics (rev. ed., New York: Eaton & Mains, 1890), p. 58.

<sup>3</sup>Ellis, op. cit., p. 42.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

## B. Alexandrian Exegesis

Alongside of this literal approach popular in Jerusalem was the allegorical approach held in Alexandria. Of this system Philo is its best known representative. Its underlying motive was to make the Scriptures agree with Greek philosophy. Coupled with this was the conviction that one should not believe anything that is unworthy of God.<sup>1</sup> When a passage that seemed to say something not in accordance with their view of God was located in the Old Testament, they resorted to the allegorical method of interpretation. The following is a description of Philo's view:

"Negatively, he says that the literal sense must be excluded when anything is stated that is unworthy of God;--when otherwise a contradiction would be involved;--and when Scripture itself allegorizes. Positively, the text is to be allegorized, when expressions are doubled; when superfluous words are used; when there is a repetition of facts already known; when an expression is varied; when synonyms are employed; when a play of words is possible in any of its varieties; when words admit of a slight alteration; when the expression is unusual; when there is anything abnormal in the number or tense."<sup>2</sup>

It can be readily seen that this opens the door up for gross misinterpretations of all sorts. Perhaps one example will be sufficient to give a general impression of Philo's allegorical interpretation. This is an exegesis of the meaning of the rivers in the Garden of Eden in Genesis 2:10-14.

"In these words Moses intends to sketch out the particular virtues. And they, also, are four in number, prudence, temperance, courage, and justice. Now the greatest river, from which the four branches

---

<sup>1</sup>Berkhof, op. cit., p. 16.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

flow off, is generic virtue, which we have already called goodness; and the four branches are the same number of virtues. Generic virtue, therefore, derives its beginning from Eden, which is the wisdom of God; which rejoices, and exults, and triumphs, being delighted at and honoured on account of nothing else, except its Father, God. And the four particular virtues are branches from the generic virtue, which, like a river, waters all the good actions of each with an abundant stream of benefits."<sup>1</sup>

### C. Apocalyptic Exegesis

Growing up alongside of these two opposing schools of interpretation were the apocalyptic writings which display an entirely different spirit from the rabbinical writings. Ellis says that "in them. . . is evidenced a truer line of succession from the prophets to Christ than the Judaism of the rabbinic order."<sup>2</sup> When the recent discoveries were made of the writings of the Qumran Sect much new light was shed upon this before rather obscure movement in Judaism. Ellis gives this rather lengthy quotation from Roberts concerning the characteristics of the Qumran material:

"In this type of exegesis the prophetic oracles are specifically made to refer to the historical person who is the author of the interpretation and to the historical circumstances he brings about, including the final redemption of all who believe in him. One cannot but sense the fundamental difference between this interpretation and the casuistic pilpulism of the Mishnaic appeal to Scripture and the ingenious metaphorical expansions of Philo. Whereas the Rabbis seem to have had a genius for inductive reasoning and the Jewish Greeks made the Scripture merely an allegory, apocalyptic passionately expounds the interpretation of the Divine promise of the Saviour and the Salvation which has been kept hidden

---

<sup>1</sup>Terry, op. cit., p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>Ellis, op. cit., p. 43.



in the Word of God until the time of its fulfilment. This seems to be basic to the story of Jesus of Nazareth, Luke 4:16ff, and equally basic to the Teacher of Righteousness in the Habakkuk scroll."<sup>1</sup>

An interesting thought along these lines is that it seems as if many of the adherents to the Qumran Sect were rebel Pharisees who were seeking a more spiritual interpretation of the Scriptures and way of life. Since some of the Pharisees and adherents to rabbinical tenets rebelled, it could be possible that Paul, being trained as a rabbi, also was not satisfied with the spirit of rabbinicism. It is not being suggested that Paul was necessarily influenced by the Qumran Society, but that he found a similar attraction in the Christian approach to the Old Testament.

Keeping in mind the preceding description of the schools of Jewish hermeneutical thought which were contemporary with Paul and the other New Testament authors, a study of Paul's use of the Old Testament prophet Isaiah in the book of Romans, is made in the next chapter. There Paul's methods are discussed and compared with the rabbinical methods discussed in this chapter in order to investigate whether the charge that Paul used the Old Testament as any rabbi would have is valid.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 44,45 from Roberts, Scrolls and Old Testament Scriptures, p. 79.

V. PAUL'S USE OF ISAIAH IN THE BOOK OF ROMANS

## V. PAUL'S USE OF ISAIAH IN THE BOOK OF ROMANS

With this chapter the heart of the subject is reached. The way has been cleared by the study of the source of the majority of Paul's quotations and allusions, the Septuagint; and by the examination of the schools of interpretation which were contemporary with the New Testament writers. It has been maintained that Paul properly used the Septuagint and did not take advantage of its weaknesses. It has also been maintained that Paul did not use the Old Testament in the absurd manner of the rabbis with either their strict literalisms or their thorough allegorisms. Now these assumptions based on the work of the previous chapters are challenged and a critical judgment made on the basis of a study of how Paul actually used Isaiah.

Before going into a study of Paul's usage in Romans, it would be well to state the main purpose of Paul in writing to the Roman Church. He takes up in detail the relations of the Jews and Gentiles to God and to each other as is unfolded in the completed revelation of Jesus Christ. These relations are considered both from the viewpoint of the past, present and future.<sup>1</sup> John Wesley in analyzing Romans says of Paul that:

"His chief design herein is to show, 1. That neither the Gentiles by the law of nature, nor the Jews by the law of Moses, could obtain justification before God; and that therefore it was necessary for both to seek it from the free mercy of God by faith. 2. That

---

<sup>1</sup>D. D. Whedon, Commentary on the New Testament, (New York: Carlton & Lanahan, 1871), Vol. III., p. 284.

God has an absolute right to show mercy on what terms he pleases and to withhold it from those who will not accept of it on his own terms."<sup>1</sup>

Paul says this same thing in Romans 11:32,

"For God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all." (A.S.V.)

One other note should be made before the quotations themselves are studied. Many references in this study are made to quotations as having their origin in the Septuagint. This does not mean that there was necessarily one version from which all the others came, but refers to the whole group of Greek Old Testaments which are commonly referred to as "the Septuagint." To have isolated each quotation and specified which manuscript was used was beyond the scope of this thesis and the materials which were available. Most of the quotations do compare very closely to "A" and it may be considered the main version to which reference is made.<sup>2</sup>

The sources used in finding material on Paul's usage of Isaiah are in the majority older Calvinists and liberals with only a few modern writers and commentators of other persuasions. This came about because these were in the main the only commentators which dealt with the problem with which this thesis was concerned.

In selecting the particular passages of Romans to be studied, only those which contained the more clear quotations of and allusions

---

<sup>1</sup>John Wesley, Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament (New York: Eaton & Mains, n.d.), p. 358.

<sup>2</sup>See page      for the discussion on the New Testament use of "A".

to the Old Testament were chosen. Each section begins with the passage from the Letter to the Romans and is followed by the passage or passages from Isaiah which are thought to be the ones quoted by Paul. These quotations are then followed by the text which contains an analysis of them.

#### A. Romans 2:24

For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you, even as it is written.

Now therefore, what do I here, saith Jehovah, seeing that my people is taken away for nought? they that rule over them do howl, saith Jehovah, and my name continually all day is blasphemed (Isaiah 52:5).

In the opening chapters of Romans, Paul builds the foundation for his great statement that all men have sinned and come short of the glory of God, both Jew and Gentile. He describes the contents of natural revelation and then points up the actual acts of men and especially of the Jews and this in relation to their professed doctrines. Starting with 2:17 Paul lists the various areas of special boasting on the part of the Jews and then shows how they are hypocrites. It is bad enough for them to be false in their religious expression, but it is even worse for them to bring the name of the one true God into disrepute. As the Jews were supposed to be the living example of what God desires of men, their unfaithfulness had a deeper effect.<sup>1</sup> It was causing the Gentiles to say that surely the god of this nation could not be the one true god. The Jews and their false dealings were known by all and caused no small

---

<sup>1</sup>Hermann Olshausen, Biblical Commentary of the New Testament trans. by A. C. Kendrick, (New York: Sheldon & Company Publishers, 1864), Vol. III, p. 513.



amount of scornful comments which were directed against them and against their God.<sup>1</sup>

As Paul was endeavoring to bring this stinging truth home to these proud people, he needed to appeal to the highest court of appeal known to him, the Old Testament Scriptures. In the book of Isaiah he found a similar occurrence to the one he was facing; he found in the words of Isaiah an analogous situation. Israel had been taken into captivity and was the source for making Jehovah's name the butt of their incessant blasphemy.<sup>2</sup> The heathen were saying that this God of Israel surely was not the true God or else he would have not allowed this to have happened to them. A really powerful and loving god would certainly have been able to protect his people better than that.

Kuenen has charged that Paul sometimes "quote(s) by sound without regard to the sense."<sup>3</sup> He allows that these passages are not quoted for proof, but even so the reference to the original passage should be rigidly preserved even when it is used for strictly rhetorical purposes. Franklin Johnson has defined what is meant by a quotation by sound:

"But they are all alike in that they give a reference to the language quoted which its author would not recognize as his own; and in this respect they are quotations 'by sound', rather than 'by sense.'<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>F. Godet, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1883), p. 129.

<sup>2</sup>Franz Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886), Vol. II, p. 296.

<sup>3</sup>Franklin Johnson, The Quotations of the New Testament From The Old Considered in the Light of General Literature (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896), p. 139.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.



A quotation "by sound" then is one in which a text is quoted on the sole basis of the words in it regardless of the meaning it would properly have if the context were considered and allowed to determine the meaning. Paul's use in Romans 2:24 is given as one of the occurrences of this type of quotation. In Paul's day God was being blasphemed because of the unrighteous conduct of the Jews. In Isaiah's day God's name was being blasphemed because he had allowed his people to go into captivity and had not delivered them. Thus the point of view of the prophet and of the apostle is not the same.

These objections can be answered in at least two ways. (1) Actually the disobedience of God's people was the cause of the blaspheming in both cases since Israel went into captivity because she would not obey God. The other approach is (2) that Paul adopted the prophet's expression as appropriate; it said just what he wanted to say.<sup>1</sup> It did sound the same, but even deeper down there seems to be the principle that one who calls himself by God's name and then is disobedient brings his name into disrepute among those who are classed as Gentiles or unbelievers.

Paul definitely shows that he is referring to the Old Testament because he says, "even as it is written." This is one of his standard forms of introducing an Old Testament quotation; the only difference from the usual procedure is that he here places it after the quotation. His quotation is from the Septuagint form of the prophecy of Isaiah

---

<sup>1</sup>H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, trans. by W. F. Dickson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1881), Part IV, Vol. I, p. 130.

although it varies from it somewhat.<sup>1</sup> Ellis says that it is at variance with the Septuagint and the Hebrew where they vary. This may point to a Septuagint text somewhat different from the one which we now possess.<sup>2</sup>

There is some discussion as to whether Paul was really thinking of Isaiah 52:5 or not. Calvin and Alexander feel that he has in mind Ezekiel 36:20 because Isaiah is not reproving the people in the book of Isaiah whereas Ezekiel does so many times in his 36th chapter. Olshausen prefers Isaiah but admits that Ezekiel might have been used.<sup>3</sup> For two reasons the identification of the quotation as being from Isaiah is accepted. By far the large majority of commentators which were consulted preferred the Isaiah passage, and thus we have followed them in this study. Godet says that in Isaiah the passage contains the same sense, but in the Ezekiel passage the similarity is only on the word level.<sup>4</sup> Since Paul does not seem to be quoting for the purpose of showing literal fulfillment but rather that of an analogous situation, the passage seems safely to be from the book of Isaiah.

---

<sup>1</sup>H. C. G. Moule, The Epistle to the Romans, (London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1896), p. 69.

<sup>2</sup>E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), p. 150.

<sup>3</sup>Olshausen, op. cit., p. 513, Vol. III.

<sup>4</sup>Godet, op. cit., p. 129.



B. Romans 3:15-17

Their feet are swift to shed blood; Destruction and misery are in their ways; And the way of peace have they not known:

Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood: their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity; desolation and destruction are in their paths. The way of peace they know not; and there is no justice in their goings: they have made them crooked paths; whosoever goeth therein doth not know peace (Isaiah 59:7,8).

Paul now drives hard to the conclusion of the first major part of the book of Romans. In verse 9 he states that both Jews and Greeks are under sin. This he follows with a list of Scriptures from the Psalms and Isaiah. He has combed the Old Testament and now weaves together into a running narrative the portions of the Scriptures which seem to best support his stand. He appeals to the sacred and accepted Scriptures for the authority needed to back up such a bold declaration as was made in verse 9. This sums up all that the apostle has been saying since early in the first chapter.

That the passage quoted above was taken from the writings of Isaiah is very apparent and not debated. It is a free abridgment of the Septuagint text<sup>1</sup> and gives the impression of being more of an extract rather than a quotation.<sup>2</sup> John Knox feels that these verses from Isaiah as well as those quoted from the Psalms in the other verses immediately

---

<sup>1</sup>William Sanday & Arthur C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903), p. 19.

<sup>2</sup>James Denney, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans in The Expositor's Greek New Testament, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company n.d.), Vol. II, p. 607.

preceeding and proceeding are used without reference to their various contexts although no serious distortions of the original meanings are involved.<sup>1</sup>

Some object that Paul's thinking is not as logical as it could have been, for he seems to argue from the particular to the general. He is in effect saying, "Some Jews were sinners, therefore, all men in the world are sinners." It is admitted that Paul is quoting sections dealing with particular individuals, yet there is a proper application to the universal principle which Paul is stating. These things were said by the Jews about the Gentiles, yet now Paul is showing the Jews that they themselves are guilty of these very same sins. From this basis Paul is able to maintain his thesis that there is no difference between the Jews and the Gentiles, both have sinned and stand guilty before God.

This premise was stated in verse 9 and is supported by a long list of quotations in verses 10-18. Then the conclusion is made in verse 23 where it is again stated that all (both Jew and Gentile) have sinned. Coupled with this is a description of the mercy which God offers to the sinner.

#### C. Romans 4:25

Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification.

Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we

---

<sup>1</sup>John Knox, "Romans", The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), p. 87.



did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. . . Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors (Isaiah 53:4-6,12).

In this passage is found a very definite allusion to the 53rd. chapter of Isaiah. That it is not a quotation is very evident for neither is it accompanied by an introductory formula nor is it congruent to any particular portion of the Old Testament. Godet suggests that Paul, although not quoting Isaiah, yet wanted to remind them of the description of the servant of Jehovah as Isaiah has painted it.<sup>1</sup> Isaiah was very familiar to any Jew and any reference to such a high point in it would be readily noticed and acknowledged. This type of literary allusion is common to all literatures and is accepted practice today.

#### D. Romans 8:33,34

Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me? let us stand up together; who is mine adversary? let him come near to me. Behold, the Lord Jehovah will help me; who is he that shall condemn me? behold, they all shall wax old as a garment; the moth shall eat them up (Isaiah 50:8,9).

Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors (Isaiah 53:12).

---

<sup>1</sup>Godet, op. cit., p. 184.

As in Romans 4:25 Paul again makes an allusion to the writings of the prophet. It is clearly not a quotation but is rather in the form of an allusion using the thought of a familiar Scripture to clothe the apostle's argument. Ellis says that the Scriptures which Paul refers to are mentioned in the Midrash as being of messianic import.<sup>1</sup> Therefore Paul was using a thought-pattern which his readers would recognize and understand. It might be objected that Paul is plagiarizing by not giving Isaiah credit for his material, however the modern concepts of quotation and plagiarizing were not known then. Quotation marks had not yet been invented. Paul was not so much quoting, but, as mentioned before, was using the language of the Old Testament to give his words authority. The Jews recognized this for what it was and found no problem then. It is not ours to make a critical problem of it but rather to understand what was acceptable common practice in Paul's day.

Whether the passage from Isaiah is used out of context or not is not an issue here. Paul is using its figure of speech and the thought which it carries rather than saying that the new context is the same as the old.

#### E. Romans 9:20

Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus?

Ye turn things upside down. Shall the potter be esteemed as clay; that the thing made should say of him that made it, He made me not; or the thing formed say of him that formed it, He hath no understanding (Isaiah 29:16)?

---

<sup>1</sup>Ellis, op. cit., p. 57.

Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker! a potsherd among the potsherds of the earth! Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou? or thy work, He hath no hands (Isaiah 45:9)?

In this section of Romans Paul is dealing specifically with the Jews and their questions about and objections to the Gospel. They feel that since they are Jews they will be saved, that is, they confused personal with national salvation. It grieved Paul greatly that all of his Jewish brethren were not saved (9:1-5). He now has to tell them just why they will not be all saved and why the message is preached in its present form. The Jews objected that if salvation was as he said, then the word of God was powerless and has accomplished nothing. To this Paul answers that "the purpose of God according to election" must stand and that salvation is not and never was by works. The Jew then objected that it was unjust for God to find fault with him if he was the victim of the irresistible and sovereign will of God. The Jew had a hard time seeing that since God had chosen the nation of Israel for certain purposes that his own personal salvation was not included. His was a very much ingrained feeling of national unity, which, although desired by God, had become a barrier in his reception of the Gospel.

It is at this point in the discussion that the next quotation from Isaiah occurs. Paul is endeavoring to meet the objector's question by clothing his reply in Old Testament language and thus investing it with Old Testament authority.<sup>1</sup> Calvin says, "But he represses this arrogance of contending with God by a most apt similtude, in which he

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph Agar Beet, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1884), p. 285.

seems to have alluded to Isaiah xlv. 9."<sup>1</sup> Many commentators feel that this quotation is a combining of Isaiah 29:16 and 45:9. The first has to do with the Israelites who were trying to hide their hypocrisy from God. The second is more in line with the way Paul uses it, that of questioning the actions of the almighty Creator.

Calvin was not too worried by the apostle's use of the Old Testament here for he says,

"We are not however to be over-particular in applying this testimony to our present subject, since Paul only meant to allude to the words of the Prophet, in order that the similitude might have more weight."<sup>2</sup>

Neither does this seeming disregard for the context of his Scripture proofs give Dean Alford any trouble. He says that verses 19-21 are meant not as an answer to objector's question but rather as a rebuke administered to the 'spirit' of the objection which "forgets the immeasurable distance between us and God, and the relation of Creator and Disposer in which He stands to us."<sup>3</sup> The Apostle's use of Isaiah's language is

". . .so exactly appropriate to the apostle's argument. . . because they are both dealing with the same subject, namely, God's formation of Israel as a nation, and His consequent unquestionable right to deal with it as seems good to him."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>John Calvin, Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, trans. and ed. by John Owen (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1955), p. 365.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 366.

<sup>3</sup>Henry Alford, The New Testament for English Readers (Chicago: Moody Press, n.d.), p. 925.

<sup>4</sup>The Methodist Commentary (London: Charles H. Kelley, 1893) in loco.

This section could be one similar to Romans 2:24 where the problem of quotation by sound was discussed and the allegation was made that even in quotations for strictly rhetorical purposes the reference of the original passage must be rigidly preserved. What has been said above should help in meeting this objection as also what was said earlier concerning 2:24. Paul may have indeed been more taken with the sound of the verses than with their contextual application, but the justification seems to be on even firmer ground than that. In both passages in Isaiah there is the questioning of God's real sovereignty over man and his actions. It would seem that Paul chose these verses, not as proofs, but as literary allusions because they had a background similar to that of his situation and expressed just what he wanted to say. He thus just used appropriate language which the prophet conveniently furnished him and was not trying to show a fulfilment of an Old Testament prophecy. Regard for context is not of primary importance in this kind of quoting although Paul does not seem to have ignored it completely, if at all.

A further note should be added concerning the source of Paul's quotations. The main part of the material comes from the Septuagint although where the LXX is not very accurate in the last clause of Isaiah 29:16 he refers to the Hebrew and renders it faithfully.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Calvin, op. cit., p. 366.



F. Romans 9:27-29

And Isaiah crieth concerning Israel, If the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, it is the remnant that shall be saved: for the Lord will execute his word upon the earth, finishing it and cutting it short. And, as Isaiah hath said before,

Except the Lord of Sabaoth  
had left us a seed,  
We had become as Sodom,  
and had been made like  
unto Gomorrah.

For though thy people, Israel, be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them shall return: a destruction is determined, overflowing with righteousness. For a full end, and that determined, will the Lord, Jehovah of hosts, make in the midst of all the earth (Isaiah 10:22,23).

Except Jehovah of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, we should have been like unto Gomorrah (Isaiah 1:9).

Here in these verses are the first two of the six times in which Paul directly attributes his material to the prophet Isaiah in the book of Romans. It would expect that when the quotation is introduced by the specific name of its Old Testament source, since this is only done about one out of three or four times, that it is to carry an even greater burden of proof in the apostle's argument. At least it should be expected to correlate with the original more closely than the others. Whether this is the case or not is studied in the following paragraphs.

Olshausen says that verse 28 follows the Septuagint exactly until and then changes it to stress the universality of judgment.<sup>1</sup> Verse 27 seems to follow the Septuagint<sup>2</sup> and verse 29 is an exact

---

<sup>1</sup>Olshausen, op. cit., p. 101.

<sup>2</sup>Sanday & Headlam, op. cit., p. 265.



quoting of the Greek Version except Paul has substituted 'seed' for 'remnant'.<sup>1</sup> The significance of this substitution is given by Adam Clarke as follows:

"Instead of remnant. . ., both the Septuagint and the apostle have, a seed, intimating that there were left just enough of the righteous to be a seed for a future harvest of true believers. So the godly were not destroyed from the land; some remained, and the harvest was in the days of the apostles."<sup>2</sup>

Thus Isaiah's meaning was not corrupted by the Apostle for to him a seed was the small portion reserved for sowing, a small reserved portion, and thus in Scripture, posterity.<sup>3</sup>

The Hebrew of Isaiah 10:22,23 is very hard to understand according to Knox in the Interpreter's Bible.<sup>4</sup> This is backed up by a similar statement from the pen of Sanday in the International Critical Commentary.<sup>5</sup> Since the Hebrew was in doubt, the Septuagint translators had a very hard time in presenting the real meaning of the passage. As Knox points out there is a great variety of interpretations even now among the various English translations.<sup>6</sup> In spite of the difficulty involved in translating this portion of Isaiah, Sanday maintains that Paul accurately

---

<sup>1</sup> Calvin, op. cit., p. 375.

<sup>2</sup> Adam Clarke, The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.) Vol. II., p. 116.

<sup>3</sup> Calvin, op. cit., p. 375.

<sup>4</sup> Knox, op. cit., p. 550.

<sup>5</sup> Sanday & Headlam, op. cit., p. 266.

<sup>6</sup> Knox, op. cit., p. 550.

reproduces the meaning of the passage.<sup>1</sup> Ellis agrees that Paul used as his main source the Septuagint but corrected it as he saw fit.<sup>2</sup>

That the variations in the quotation do not touch the sense of the original is held by Dr. Beet who goes on to say that "the quote from Isaiah proves that the limitation of salvation to a portion of the Jews accords with prophecy."<sup>3</sup> How can this be, he asked, when Isaiah was speaking about the return of the nation from exile and Paul is speaking about salvation? Is not this just another case of Paul the rabbi in operation?

To better understand Paul in this usage of Isaiah the thought of the whole section must be brought into view. Paul has been showing that God rejected the great body of Jews for their infidelity, not for any other reason. The promise to Abraham has been amply fulfilled for the Jews were very numerous. The Lord will destroy the majority of the nation because of their unbelief. This was occasioned through Assyria's strong arm in Isaiah's day and was now being performed through the preaching of the Gospel. Out of this destruction, however, a very few were saved and are referred to as the "remnant" or the "seed." God in his mercy preserved a very small segment of the Jewish nation or else they would have been just as extinct as Sodom and Gomorrah. Adam Clarke

---

<sup>1</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 266.

<sup>2</sup>Ellis, op. cit., p. 551.

<sup>3</sup>Beet, op. cit., p. 289.

concludes that:

"...it is no new thing with God to abandon the greatest part of the Jewish nation, when corrupt, and to confine his favour and blessing to a righteous, believing few."<sup>1</sup>

Olshausen says that Paul selected these verses from Isaiah rather than from some other portion of the Scriptures because Isaiah mentions an holy remnant whereas the others do not.<sup>2</sup> Thus this is not just a quotation by sound rather than by meaning, for Paul correctly finds the idea of a remnant surviving in both places. He also seems to express the belief that the actions of the Israelites as a nation are typical of the Christian Church.<sup>3</sup>

Thus there seems to be no real charge which can be laid against Paul in this section that he, as the rabbis, quoted for his own profit and not for the meaning which was there.

#### G. Romans 9:32,33

They stumbled at the stone of stumbling; even as it is written,  
Behold, I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling  
and a rock of offence;  
And he that believeth on him shall not be  
put to shame.

And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling  
and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin  
and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Isaiah 8:14).

Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone,  
a precious corner-stone of sure foundation: he that believeth  
shall not be in haste (Isaiah 28:16).

---

<sup>1</sup>Adam Clarke, op. cit., p. 116.

<sup>2</sup>Olshausen, op. cit., p. 101.

<sup>3</sup>Beet, op. cit., p. 290.



This is an interesting passage and one which has received the attention of the critics down through the years. Kuenen objects to this verse in two ways. First, he doesn't think that it is right to present in the form of a single passage an assemblage of phrases or sentences drawn from different sources.<sup>1</sup> Second, it is not right for anyone to make their own additions to an Old Testament passage when quoting it in such a way as to make it seem that the original author wrote it just as quoted.<sup>2</sup>

In answering the first objection Franklin Johnson attempts to answer Kuenen as follows:

"An examination of these passages will show that where the quotation is intended for proof, it is always composed of fragments which originally related to the subject of the argument; and all of them except one or two are brought forward as proofs."<sup>3</sup>

To show that this is a common form of literary procedure, Johnson produces parallel examples from the writings of Plato, Plutarch, Cicero, Philo, and Ruskin.<sup>4</sup> This is not something which only the rabbis did, but rather is an universal practice among great authors of all ages.

It is commonly acknowledged that in I Peter 2:6 the same union of texts is found, except that Peter adds Psalm 118:22. Olshausen says that, referring to the passages in Isaiah,

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnson, op. cit., pp. 92, 93.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 29-31.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 93.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 93-102.

"Neither of these passages relates to the Messiah in its immediate connexion, but they had been typically applied to him as early as the Chaldean and Rabbinical paraphrases, and Paul with propriety so applies them."<sup>1</sup>

Godet supports this contention by saying:

"According to viii.11, the foundation is Jehovah; and it is on this stone that the unbelieving Israel of both kingdoms stumble, while on this rock he that believes takes refuge. In chap. xxviii, the figure is somewhat modified; for Jehovah is no longer the foundation; it is He who lays it. The foundation here is therefore Jehovah in His final manifestation, the Messiah. We thus understand why Paul has combined the two passages so closely; the one explains the other. It is in the sense which we have just established that the same figure is applied to Christ, Luke ii.34, xx.17,18; I Pet. ii.4. . ."<sup>2</sup>

The way is now cleared for discussion of the second criticism which has been made of Paul's usage of the Old Testament in this passage. The objection of Kuenen was that Paul unjustly added the words 'on him' in verse 33 thus giving it a different meaning.

Johnson's answer to this objection is twofold.

"First, the words 'in him' are found also in the Targum on the passage, proving that the rabbis were accustomed to insert them as an explanation of the meaning. They also considered the passage Messianic, as the Targum shows."<sup>3</sup>

"But secondly, we do not need to insist upon this. . ."

"The apostles taught that Christ was God manifest in the flesh. Hence, to believe on Jehovah truly was to believe on Christ, and to believe on Christ was to believe on Jehovah: 'Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also'. All Christians today hold this. Much, therefore, of that which was said of Jehovah could be applied to Christ with perfect propriety, as in the quotation before us,

---

<sup>1</sup>Olshausen, op. cit., p. 104.

<sup>2</sup>Godet, op. cit., p. 369.

<sup>3</sup>Johnson, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

where the effect of faith in Jehovah and the effect of faith in Christ are justly held to be similar or identical."<sup>1</sup>

This conclusion of Johnson's is backed up by the best of commentators. Calvin agrees that the quotation was rightly made because Christ is the God of the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup> (So also Olshausen, Beet, Luther, Clarke, Wesley, Whedon, and Godet to name a few.) Even Knox writing in the Interpreter's Bible says that "stone" is a symbol of God's help, and thus Paul can say that it is the Christ.<sup>3</sup>

#### H. Romans 10:11

For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be put to shame.

Therefore thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not be in haste (Isaiah 28:16).

This passage is the same as quoted by Paul in the last set of verses considered, Romans 9:32,33, from Isaiah 28:16. There is one addition to the verse used by Paul which does not occur in the first usage, and that is the addition of which changes "he who" to "whosoever." Sanday and Headlam say that is added to the Septuagint reading in order to bring out the point on which emphasis is to be laid.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 46-47.

<sup>2</sup>Calvin, op. cit., p. 380.

<sup>3</sup>Knox, op. cit., p. 552.

<sup>4</sup>Sanday & Headlam, op. cit., p. 290.



Paul has just established faith as the condition of salvation and now he is trying to show that this is universally so.<sup>1</sup> Many expositors maintain that this thought of universality is contained in the thought of the original passage in Isaiah.

The addition of "on him" has been considered in detail in the last section and need not to be considered again.

Some have objected that the Septuagint reading of "shame" for "haste" is not only incorrect but misleading. However haste contains within it the idea of shame, for one who is in haste is likely to do things in a manner which will bring shame upon him.<sup>2</sup> Also the one who trusts in Christ does not have to hurry away from God because of his own shame. The believer is afraid of nothing and ashamed of nothing in Christ.<sup>3</sup>

#### I. Romans 10:15,16

And how shall they preach, except they be sent? even as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things! But they did not all hearken to the glad tidings. For Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?

How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, They God reigneth (Isaiah 52:7)!

Who hath believed our message? and to whom hath the arm of Jehovah been revealed (Isaiah 53:1)?

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Calvin, op. cit., p. 395.

<sup>3</sup>Martin Luther, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, trans. by J. Theodore Mueller (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954), p. 128.

The question that is asked concerning Paul's use of Scripture in this portion of Romans is just what is he trying to prove. Several views have been advanced.<sup>1</sup> The Roman Catholic Church believes that Paul was trying to justify an apostolic ministry. Calvin says that it was written to justify preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles. Chrysostom had a somewhat different view, for he held that it was to show that the ignorance of the Jews was culpable because they have had abundant opportunity to hear.

Along with the purpose of quoting this section of Isaiah is the question of how Paul could use this passage to prove his point. On this point Sanday & Headlam observe that,

"St. Paul quotes it because he wishes to describe in Old Testament language the fact which will be recognized as true when stated, and to show that these facts are in accordance with the Divine method."<sup>2</sup>

He continues by saying that, "in Isaiah the messengers carry abroad the message of restoration from captivity, thus Paul says apostles announce the end of the captivity of sin."<sup>3</sup>

Knox does not follow this method of explaining Paul's use of the Old Testament. He says,

"Such a way of interpreting scripture may be, according to our standards, faulty to the point of being absurd, but, it conforms to typical rabbinical exegesis in Paul's time. . . ."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Sanday & Headlam, op. cit., pp. 294-295.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 296.      <sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Knox, op. cit., p. 563.



Certainly this does seem to be another case of quotation by sound rather than by meaning as far as Knox and Kuenen are concerned.<sup>1</sup>

The only answer to the above criticism is one which would show that Paul did not ignore the original meaning of these passages he quotes. Olshausen approaches it thus:

"The passages from the second part of Isaiah, which are quoted in this section, are all to be considered as most properly evangelical; all other applications -- e. g., to the people of Israel, the prophets, or the better members of the people -- are not excluded by this, but by a typical interpretation lead us back to the evangelical sense."<sup>2</sup>

Brown believes that Paul correctly interprets the real meaning of Isaiah's words for he says,

"The whole chapter of Isaiah from which this is taken, and the three that follow, are so richly messianic, that there can be no doubt "the glad tidings" there spoken of announce a more glorious release than that of Judah from the Babylonish captivity, and the very feet of its preachers are called "beautiful" for the sake of their message. What a call and what encouragement is here to missionary activity in the Church!"<sup>3</sup>

A comment made by Calvin may add some light on Paul's usage here. He believes that this quotation does not belong to the argument but is interjected to anticipate the objection that faith always follows the word because the Jews had never been without the word.<sup>4</sup> It does not seem as if the passage is quoted to show its fulfilment, but rather to

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnson, op. cit., p. 139, 150.

<sup>2</sup>Olshausen, op. cit., p. 111.

<sup>3</sup>Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments, (Glasgow: William Collins, Sons & Company, 1870), Vol. VI. p. 256.

<sup>4</sup>Calvin, op. cit., p. 400.

show that the Jews had had an abundant opportunity to know God's real plan of salvation and that it included the Gentiles, therefore, they, the Jews, were at fault and personally guilty for their ignorance and opposition.

In regards to the second usage of Isaiah in these verses, Godet maintains that,

"This disobedience was in fact foreseen and proclaimed, Isa. liii. 1, without, however, the guilt of Israel being thereby diminished, divine foreknowledge not annulling human liberty. -- Isaiah in this passage proclaims the unbelief of the people of Israel in regard to the Messiah, giving a description of His entire appearance in His state of humiliation and pain."<sup>1</sup>

This whole portion of Isaiah was thought to be full of Messianic import for even the Rabbis said this referred to the coming of the Messiah and so interpreted it.<sup>2</sup>

It would now seem that Paul's usage of the Old Testament can be defended and explained in this section of Romans by making two assertions. First, Paul was not quoting for proof but for illustration and rhetorical purposes. He wanted to show that their reaction to the message of God was the same as in days past and that God's method in dealing with them had not changed. Second, Paul used portions of the Old Testament which did have and were commonly understood to have messianic import in his day. Paul certainly does not use this section of Isaiah without any regard for its context and meaning as so often the rabbis did. He may have agreed with them concerning the message of the passage, but he

---

<sup>1</sup>Godet, op. cit., p. 387.

<sup>2</sup>Sanday & Headlam, op. cit., p. 296.

certainly used better methods than they for arriving at its truth. This passage, as did others, contained more than was fulfilled by the releasing of the Jews from captivity. Paul saw this and found the ultimate completion of the prophet's words in the life and work of Christ.

J. Romans 10:20,21

And Isaiah is very bold, and saith,  
     I was found of them that sought me not;  
     I became manifest unto them that asked  
         not of me.  
 But as to Israel he saith,  
     All the day long did I spread out my  
         hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying  
         people.

I am inquired of by them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, that walk in a way that is not good, after their own thoughts (Isaiah 65:1,2).

In this section of Romans Paul is showing the Jews that Israel has had abundant opportunity to hear and to accept the glad tidings of God. When their long expected and desired Messiah came they would not believe the report. Thus Paul concludes his argument in this section by quoting from the great prophet, Isaiah. He appeals to Isaiah for support in his assertion that the glad tidings would be taken to the Gentiles who did not even have the slightest idea that it existed, as well as to the Jews who had ample knowledge of it.

The main problem which has confronted scholars in these verses is that Paul seems to have employed illogical reasoning in applying Isaiah 65:1 to the Gentiles. This seems to be a form of proof-texting which overlooks the real meaning of the verse and only listens to the

sound of its words.<sup>1</sup>

Knox, writing in the Interpreter's Bible, finds this section to be a typical example of rabbinical exegesis of Paul's time. To Knox such an application of Isaiah is so incorrect that it is properly labeled absurd.<sup>2</sup> Sanday and Headlam are not quite so strong in their criticism of Paul, yet they agree that Paul is mistaken in using Isaiah 65:1,2 in that way. They say:

"In the original both this verse and the preceding are addressed to apostate Israel; St. Paul applies the first part to the Gentiles, the latter part definitely to Israel."<sup>3</sup>

In his discussion of this matter Beet centers the problem in the phrase "But touching Israel" in verse 21.<sup>4</sup>

Johnson discusses these verses at some length in his book, The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old. He comments:

". . . the apostle regards the first verse of this quotation as referring to the Gentiles, and the second to the Jews. Many critics refer both verses to Israel, and they construe both verses, therefore, as a single sentence, and not as two sentences. There is no ground for this divergence from the apostolic interpretation. That the first verse refers to the Gentiles and the second to the Jews, is held by interpreters of all schools, as, for example, Delitzsch, Hofmann, Stier, Nagelsbach, Alexander, Hodge, and Alford."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnson, op. cit., p. 335.

<sup>2</sup>Knox, op. cit., p. 563.

<sup>3</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 300.

<sup>4</sup>Beet, op. cit., p. 308.

<sup>5</sup>Johnson, op. cit., pp. 356, 357.

To substantiate what Johnson has claimed we shall look into some of the sources he refers to. First, Alexander says that Isaiah 65:1 must refer to the Gentiles because,

"It is a standing characteristic of the Jews in the Old Testament, that they were called by the name of Jehovah; but if they may also be described in terms directly opposite, whenever the interpreter prefers it, then may anything mean anything."<sup>1</sup>

He also says that,

"The same intention to expound the Prophet's language is clear from the Apostle's mention of Isaiah's boldness in thus shocking the most cherished prepossessions of the Jews."<sup>2</sup>

Delitzsch also defends this viewpoint by saying that Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin all defend Paul's exegesis and exposition of Isaiah 65:1 in Romans 10:20,21. He says,

"The apostle shows, by the way in which he applies the Scripture, how he depended in this instance upon the Septuagint translation, which was in his own hands and those of his readers also, and by which the allusion to the Gentiles is naturally suggested, even if not actually demanded. And we may also assume that the apostle himself understood the Hebrew text. . . in the same sense, viz., as relating to the calling of the Gentiles, without being therefore legally bound to adopt the same interpretation."<sup>3</sup>

Delitzsch does, though, give some room to the critical approach and says that there is a possibility of its being right, especially if the verse is looked at in the Hebrew only.<sup>4</sup> However, in his exposition he does seem to support Paul's usage.

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph Addison Alexander, Isaiah (New York: John Wiley, 1859), Vol. II, p. 413.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 413.

<sup>3</sup>Delitzsch, op. cit., Vol. II., p. 475.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 476.



There is then, support for the position that Paul correctly understood Isaiah and applied Isaiah 65:1 to the Gentiles. It seems that in the main only those who oppose such a view are those who are more anxious to find fault with the Bible than they are to find a way to correctly understand it.

K. Romans 11:8

According as it is written, God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this very day.

For Jehovah hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes, the prophets; and your heads, the seers, hath he covered (Isaiah 29:10).

The old argument of illogical reasoning is again encountered in this citation. Kuenen and Toy both find fault with Paul's usage here.<sup>1</sup>

Toy says,

"In Isaiah, God announces that all nations shall abandon their idols and worship the God of Israel, bend the knee to him in token of allegiance, swear by him as their God. The apostle, laying the stress on the term 'confess' (which, however, is not properly in the Hebrew), finds here a prediction ('for it is written') of the last judgment; we must not judge our brethren, says he seeing we shall all be judged by God."<sup>2</sup>

This would imply that the apostle has misused his text and proved something of which Isaiah wasn't even speaking.

Johnson finds no basis for this criticism as he says,

"For it is by no means certain that the apostle finds in Isaiah 'a prediction of the last judgment.' It is held by many scholars that he announces a proposition and sustains it by two arguments.

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnson, op. cit., pp. 336, 357, 93.

<sup>2</sup>C. H. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884), in loco.

The proposition which he announces is that we ought not to set ourselves up as judges of our brethren by indulging in harsh criticisms of them. . . Each of these arguments is introduced by the word 'for': 'for we shall all stand'; 'for it is written' . . . In this case he does not wrest them from their original purport, but regards the prediction of the universal submission of men to God in the future progress of the human race as finding its ultimate and highest fulfillment at the last day, of which all previous fulfillments are but types and shadows."<sup>1</sup>

This passage is understood by Sanday and Headlam as referring to the chosen people who have from the beginning shown the same obstinate adherence to their own views and a power of resisting the Holy Spirit; and God has throughout punished them for their obstinacy by giving them over to spiritual blindness.<sup>2</sup> To Sanday and Headlam this would suggest "a general law of God's dealing with them."<sup>3</sup>

To Dr. Williams of Ohio Wesleyan University the apostle's answer is clear.

"He has just said, in the fourth verse, that the Israel of Elijah's day had lapsed from their fidelity until only seven thousand were left to be counted in God's Church. So now, he says, the Israel of the present day have missed the object of their search (justification before God), and only "the election", the "select remnant" of Paul's own times, has attained to it. . . The election alone obtained it, because they sought it from faith in Christ, and the apostle declares that the rest of Israel, the great bulk of the nation, were hardened, and blind, and deaf, and out of touch with God and his plan; and in confirmation of this he quotes, as is his custom, the testimony of their own Scriptures to their condemnation."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnson, op. cit., p. 359.

<sup>2</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 315.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 314.

<sup>4</sup>William G. Williams, An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans (Cincinnati: Jennings and Rye, 1902), p. 338.

Now it is seen that Paul quoted Isaiah not so much to prove that this was what he was talking about specifically, but rather to show that this has been the general outcome of God's dealings with them in the past when they would not listen to Him. To quote Sanday and Headlam again, it "suggests a general law of God's dealing with them."<sup>1</sup> Thus Paul is not trying to prove the last judgment, but rather is showing the general judgment of God upon unbelief.

A further note should be added to make clear the form used by Paul and Isaiah which seems to suggest the unconditional predestination and hardening of the Israelites. Williams goes into a lengthy discussion of it of which the following quotation is the heart.

"Those quotations are marked with a rhetorical peculiarity, common in English and very common in Hebrew, in which some unanticipated result of an action is stated as if the purpose. Thus Shakespeare says: 'The duke was thrust from Milan, that his issue should become king of Naples.' (Tempest, v, 205.) So we may say, 'The Jews rebelled against Rome, that they might be destroyed.' It is thus that Isaiah and Paul say, 'God gave them eyes, that they may not see.' Of course the sense in every such instance is plain; only people who do not understand the laws of rhetoric, and fatalists, misunderstand. Prospero was banished from Milan, but his son became king of Naples. The Jews rebelled, and were destroyed. 'God gave them eyes, yet they did not see; and ears, yet they did not hear.'<sup>2</sup>

L. Romans 11:34

For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?

Who hath directed the Spirit of Jehovah, or being his counselor hath taught him (Isaiah 40:13)?

---

<sup>1</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 315.

<sup>2</sup>Williams, op. cit., p. 338.



This beautiful section of St. Paul's is one which stands forth with a majestic beauty which towers it above much of his other writing. After spending three chapters on the subject of Israel and her relation to the Gospel and through the Gospel to the Gentile, Paul concludes his discussion. He has developed both the themes of Divine sovereignty and the freedom of man's will which he resolves as best as earthly understanding can ever do. Knox says regarding this section, "The problem is not solved; but the perplexity is overcome in an act of worship."<sup>1</sup>

In praising the way in which God operates things in this universe, Paul chose the language of Isaiah 40:13 from the Septuagint.<sup>2</sup> Concerning the original meaning and the meaning which Paul attributes to it Godet says,

"This question in the mouth of the prophet applies to the wonders of creation. Paul extends it to those of the divine government in general, for the works of God in history are only the continuation of those in nature."<sup>3</sup>

There really seems to be little problem with Paul using this verse, for he does not use it except to use its language. Isaiah had said it so well, and Paul was so steeped in the writings of the prophet, that it was only natural for Paul to use some of Isaiah's expressions when they fit. This is a common literary practice among writers of all ages.

---

<sup>1</sup>Knox, op. cit., p. 578.

<sup>2</sup>Ellis, op. cit., p.

<sup>3</sup>Godet, op. cit., p. 418.

M. Romans 11:26,27

And so all Israel shall be saved: even as it is written,  
 There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer;  
 He shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:  
 And this is my covenant unto them,  
 When I shall take away their sins.

Therefore by this shall the iniquity of Jacob be forgiven, and this is all the fruit of taking away his sin: that he maketh all the stones of the altar as chalk-stones that are beaten in sunder, so that the Asherim and the sun-images shall rise no more (Isaiah 27:9).

And a Redeemer will come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith Jehovah. And as for me, this is my covenant with them, saith Jehovah: my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith Jehovah, from henceforth and for ever (Isaiah 59:20,21).

In this passage Paul quotes very accurately from the Septuagint except he changes "to Zion" to "out of Zion" and "his sin" to "their sins." He blends two passages of Isaiah into one of his own, Isaiah 59:20, 21 and 27:9. This is another evidence of Paul's dependence upon the Greek Version of the Old Testament in his writing and perhaps his preaching also.

It is said that Paul quotes Isaiah 59:20, not to prove, but as agreeing with his statements in verses 25, 26a.<sup>1</sup> In those verses he has stated that "all Israel shall be saved" after the "fulness of the Gentiles." Now Paul shows just what he meant by these words and how they apply to the teachings of the Old Testament.

As to the real meaning here there is much debate. Godet believes

---

<sup>1</sup>Beet, op. cit., p. 325.

that ". . .the meaning is that He who shall deliver Sion from its long oppression, will do so by taking away iniquity from the entire people."<sup>1</sup> To fill this thought out and add some to it there is the comment of Sanday and Headlam. They maintain that its application to the messianic kingdom is in accordance with the spirit of the original and with Rabbinical interpretation.<sup>2</sup> Olshausen says that Paul was only concerned "with the leading idea, that, according to the Old Testament, a deliverance is to be expected for Israel."<sup>3</sup> This is taught by both passages. Adam Clarke maintains that this passage is a prediction of an event yet to come for at the time Paul wrote no such turning of the Jews had yet occurred.<sup>4</sup>

If this quotation by Paul of Isaiah be understood as being a prophecy rather than as a fulfillment, and the context does indeed give this impression, then a different use of the Old Testament is encountered than before. Paul has picked up a prophecy from Isaiah and projects it still further into the future. Paul recognized that this prophecy had not yet but would be fulfilled.

#### N. Romans 11:11

For it is written,  
     As I live, saith the Lord, to me  
     every knee shall bow,  
     And every tongue shall confess  
     to God.

---

<sup>1</sup>Godet, op. cit., p. 412.

<sup>2</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 336.

<sup>3</sup>Olshausen, op. cit., p. 131.

<sup>4</sup>Clarke, op. cit., p. 133, Vol VI.

By myself have I sworn, the word is gone forth from my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear (Isaiah 45:23).

In Romans 14 Paul gives advice concerning conduct which might effect the weaker brother and warns against a spirit of criticism which seemed to have been a problem among them and was occasioned by scruples of the weaker brother. In the middle of his discussion of judgment Paul sets it against the backdrop of the final judgment of God, the judgment-seat of God as he calls it. Of the various commentaries consulted, Calvin's seemed to have the clearest insight here:

"He seems to me to have quoted this testimony of the prophet, not so much to prove what he had said of the judgment-seat of Christ, which was not doubted among Christians, as to show that judgment ought to be looked for by all with the greatest humility and lowliness of mind; and this is what the words import."<sup>1</sup>

Isaiah was not discussing the judgment-seat of God so much as he was describing "the expectation of the universal character of Messianic rule."<sup>2</sup> It might have been quoted as a fulfilment if the idea was that this was the full and final fulfilment of what Isaiah was referring to.<sup>3</sup> This could be accepted if the idea of multiple fulfilments could be established as being true. Some prophecies certainly seem to have several fulfilments with the final one connected with the establishment of the Kingdom of God. This seemed very definitely to be the case in Romans 10:15, 16.

---

<sup>1</sup> Calvin, op. cit., pp. 501, 502.

<sup>2</sup> Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 389.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

Paul follows Isaiah 45:23 in his quotation except for one matter, the form of the oath. Paul quotes Isaiah as saying, "As I live," when actually he said, "By myself have I sworn." This is the only place in which Isaiah departs from his standard form "as I live," and decides to use another. In Isaiah 49:18 the usual form is found. Could it not be that Paul was quoting from memory here and simply transposed the two salutations? Accuracy in quoting only seemed to be necessary for the purpose of setting forth the basic idea clearly. Peripheral words and phrases did not need to be quoted exactly. In this case Paul quotes the passage fairly, and his change in the salutation does not effect the meaning of what he has to say at all.

0. Romans 15:12

And again, Isaiah saith,  
 There shall be the root of Jesse,  
 And he that ariseth to rule over  
 the Gentiles;  
 On him shall the Gentiles hope.

And it shall come to pass in that day, that the root of Jesse, that standeth for an ensign of the peoples, unto him shall the nations seek; and his resting-place shall be glorious (Isaiah 11:10).

This quotation is from the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament which is more of a paraphrase of the Hebrew than a translation,<sup>1</sup> yet the differences are of such a nature that they do not touch the subject being treated.<sup>2</sup> Calvin evidently likes this passage, for he says,

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 399.

<sup>2</sup>Beet, op. cit., p. 364.

"This prophecy is the most illustrious of them all: for in that passage, the Prophet, when things were almost past hope, comforted the small remnant of the faithful, even by this, -- that there would arise a shoot from the dry and the dying trunk of David's family, and that a branch would flourish from his despised root, which would restore to God's people their pristine glory."<sup>1</sup>

The problem involved in this passage is one which has been encountered many times before, that of quoting something for a purpose other than that for which it was written. Knox is kind but nevertheless critical when he says, ". . . Paul is not misrepresenting that literature i.e., the Old Testament as a whole, even though, as often, he may misinterpret it in detail. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

Again the reader is referred to an examination of the contents of both the passages and see if there is not a common ground of meeting to which Paul is looking.

Paul is driving home the point of the universality of the praise which will be given God for sending His Son to all mankind, even the Gentiles.<sup>3</sup> In verse 12 Paul is especially mentioning the fact that the Gentiles are included in this, and that this was mentioned by the prophet Isaiah long years before. This then harmonizes with Isaiah, for he describes the Messianic kingdom which is to take the place of the Jewish kingdom which was soon to be destroyed.<sup>4</sup> Thus there is a common element in both, that of a deliverance for the Jews and its extension to the

---

<sup>1</sup>Calvin, op. cit., pp. 522, 523.

<sup>2</sup>Knox, op. cit., p. 640.

<sup>3</sup>Alford, op. cit., p. 965.

<sup>4</sup>Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 399.



Gentiles. This Paul refers to in this passage of Romans.

P. Romans 15:21

But, as it is written,  
 They shall see, to whom no tidings  
 of him came,  
 And they who have not heard shall  
 understand.

So shall he sprinkle many nations; kings shall shut their mouths  
 at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and  
 that which they had not heard shall they understand. (Isaiah 52:15).

"The prophet speaks here of the Gentile kings and people to whom  
 the declaration of the Messiah's work shall come for the first time."<sup>1</sup>  
 Certainly it is a message of good tidings when God brings salvation  
 through Jesus Christ to a people who did not even know of His coming nor  
 were awaiting it. Paul is showing that the Gospel extends far out beyond  
 the national borders which had confined Judaism for long centuries. Now  
 all people, yes even the Gentiles, were to receive God's good news of  
 salvation through the promised Messiah, Jesus Christ.

Knox feels that Paul does not do justice to Isaiah in this passage.

"Isa. 52:15 tells how the nations will be startled by the appear-  
 ance of God's (suffering) servant and will be amazed to see and  
 contemplate what they had been given no reason to expect. Paul  
 turns this passage to a quite different use, throwing the emphasis  
 not upon the wonder and strangeness of the thing seen, but upon  
 the mere fact of its not having been seen before."<sup>2</sup>

Rather than make this such a bold criticism, could it not be taken in  
 the form of an observation? Does it mean that Paul misquotes just  
 because he picks up a point for emphasis which didn't receive the full

---

<sup>1</sup>Godet, op. cit., p. 481.

<sup>2</sup>Knox, op. cit., p. 647.

attention of the prophet? Paul did not ignore the prophet's emphasis but rather found the thought of the people not having seen the Servant before to be the element which needed his attention. The people were familiar with the first part, but evidently they had overlooked the message of the latter part. They had probably overlooked it because they did not want to include the Gentile into their tight little clique.

As to the language of this passage, it follows the Septuagint Version exactly.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Olshausen, op. cit., p. 169.

## VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

## VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

### Summary

In the Introduction the problem area of this thesis was presented as being a study of the manner in which the New Testament writers quoted from and used the Old Testament. In order to limit the subject to the place where it could be adequately covered within the scope of a Bachelor of Divinity thesis, only Paul's use of the prophet Isaiah in the book of Romans was studied. It was felt that such a study would be representative of Paul's use of the Old Testament in particular and of the total New Testament usage in general.

This study might not have been justified except for one large fact. Very little has been written on it. Especially in recent years the number of works dealing with it have been very few. Many commentators make brief summaries of the subject but not detailed analyses, nor even more important, do they strive to lay a philosophy which would give a basic approach to the problem.

Of most value in preparing this thesis was the book by Johnson, The Quotations of the New Testament From the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature. His contribution was to show that the New Testament writers used the same principles of literary quotation as the great authors of Greece, Rome and England. They were not limited to the twisted and fantastic procedures of the rabbis as is so commonly suggested. However, it is true that they used similar forms of literary expression.

The form for quotations in the days when the New Testament was written was much different from the form used in modern literature. Quotation marks had not been invented yet. Also the works quoted were not generally available and even when they were available were much different than today's. They were written on long scrolls with no page numbers. A direct reference would have indeed been difficult if not impossible.

The main sources of the New Testament quotations were the many versions of the Greek Old Testament which are referred to as a group by the name Septuagint. It was thought for a long time that there was an original Septuagint Version from which the various versions have stemmed, but the trend of recent thought, however, is towards the concept of multiple origins.

The New Testament writers were justified in using the Septuagint because it was the main version of the Hebrew Scriptures available to the people of the day. Also the language of the Septuagint formed the linguistic link between the Hebrew language and the Greek of Paul's day. The New Testament authors never took advantage of the errors which were in the Septuagint although they didn't always mention them or make comment on them. When necessary they corrected them from the Hebrew or Aramaic with which they were also acquainted, especially Paul.

In using the Septuagint the New Testament authors differ considerably from those who were contemporary with them. The Jews were divided into two main schools of interpretation and at least one minor one. There were the literalists who considered every part of every letter to be itself inspired and on this basis made precise and

meticulous deductions from them. Since every word was equal to any other word in importance, many times accidentals were emphasized while the essentials were virtually overlooked. Opposing this Palestinian literalism was the Alexandrian allegorism which imposed Greek philosophy upon the Old Testament Scriptures. Philo led this group in their desire to find the teachings of the Greek philosophers in the Scriptures and to allegorize away the objectionable portions which did not agree. They had little to do with the literal meaning and the historical setting.

In contrast to these two extremes of Jewish hermeneutics was the growing number of apocalyptic writings which have been discovered, especially those among the recent Qumran findings. They were centered around the concept of a personal Messiah who was or who had come and in whom was salvation. This last group was in many ways similar to the New Testament Christians in their philosophy of history and interpretation of the Old Testament. If Paul was influenced by any of these systems of interpretation, this latter comes the closest to the New Testament standards. Paul was raised in the strictly literal school but abandoned it for a more spiritual hermeneutic.

In the section on Paul's use of Isaiah in the book of Romans, Paul's usage of the Old Testament was dealt with in detail. It was found there that when Paul quoted from Isaiah, he did so in several ways. Sometimes he quotes to show fulfillment, sometimes to show similarity, sometimes to project Isaiah's prophecy further into the future, still other times to show that the prophecy had more than one fulfillment, and finally to make use of Isaiah's language in expressing his own thoughts. He always quotes the Old Testament as an authority, and even



when he merely uses its language, he does so on the basis of its implied authority.

Paul strikes below the level of words alone and brings out the real meaning of the Old Testament passages he uses. He doesn't ignore their context or historical setting, but seeks the meaning which the prophet himself had in mind, or at least of God when he spoke through the prophet. This is what is meant by the term "spiritual meaning." It is not an extra meaning, but rather the only true meaning expressed in its complete depth.

### Conclusions

From the study of Paul's use of the writings of Isaiah and the background chapters which led up to that study, the following conclusions have been drawn.

1. Conclusions regarding Paul's view of the authority of the Old Testament:
  - a. Paul drew upon situations in Isaiah which were similar to his own in order to more authoritatively present his points. When he did this, he always used passages which taught the same basic principles.
  - b. Paul drew upon the Old Testament to illustrate his writing and thus considered it to contain an authority which would lead his readers to accept what he was writing.
  - c. Paul quoted from both sections of Isaiah and directly attributed them to him, thus considering the book to be a unity.

2. Conclusions regarding Paul's view of the relevancy of the Old Testament for today:

- a. Paul used the Jewish Scriptures to refute some of the cherished preconceptions of the Jews which kept them from accepting the fact that they were sinners and needed salvation through faith in Christ.
- b. Israel is considered to be a type of the New Testament Church, and its experiences have their parallels in the life of the Church.
- c. Paul understood the Old Testament references to God and Jehovah as being equally applicable to Jesus Christ. In this the language of the Septuagint played an important role as it furnished the linguistic bridge between the Hebrew and the Koine Greek.
- d. Paul found general laws of God's dealing with men in the Old Testament and thus could validly project them into his present situation even though the situations differed.

3. Conclusions regarding Paul's view of the language of the Old Testament:

- a. Paul used the common literary forms of quotation which were used in his day. To have used any other would have hindered his ability to communicate to his readers. There were no such devices such as quotation marks nor were there laws regarding plagiarism.
- b. Paul's usage is in harmony with the methods of the great writers of Greece, Rome, and England and is not limited to the principles

employed by the rabbis. There are similarities but these are the same as would be found if Plato, for example, would be compared to the rabbis.

- c. Often times Paul drew upon the language of the Old Testament as an apt manner of expressing his own thoughts. These instances must not be pressed into the molds of strict quotations. They are a literary device and do not show fulfillment.
- d. Paul, at times, took portions of several passages from Isaiah and wove them into a single Old Testament reference. This is not doing the prophet an injustice because all the verses refer to the same general subject.
- e. Paul had no scruples about changing a word when it tended to obscure the teaching of the verse. To him meaning was more important than mere words.
- f. The last conclusion definitely led to the next which is that Paul did not hold to a rigid mechanical view of inspiration. The Scriptures were fully inspired, but this went deeper than the words which were the surface expressions of something larger. The words were important, but Paul could see beyond them to the meaning of the prophet.
- g. Paul quoted from memory much of the time, therefore, his words were not always exact, although the meaning was the same.
- h. Paul used the modern version of his day but corrected it from the Hebrew as needed.

4. Conclusions regarding Paul's view of the time of fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy:
  - a. Some Old Testament prophecies were fulfilled in the life and ministry of Jesus Christ.
  - b. Some Old Testament prophecies, although seemingly fulfilled in the days of Isaiah or shortly after, were not yet fully completed when Paul was writing. They are thus projected forward into the future by Paul.
  - c. Some Old Testament prophecies have more than one fulfillment, with the final fulfillment to be found in the consummation of the Kingdom of God.

From these preceding conclusions drawn from Paul's use of the Old Testament, may be drawn the following principles of Old Testament interpretation.

1. The Old Testament is to be considered as authoritative in its pronouncements upon and insights into the various elements of the Christian life.
2. The happenings which have been recorded in the Old Testament reveal general laws of God's dealing with men which may be validly projected into present-day situations.
3. These general laws and their operation provide the setting for a proper typology which considers the vicissitudes of the Jewish nation as illustrative of the New Testament Church.
4. The Old Testament is to be approached, understood, and quoted in accordance with the principles used to interpret all good literature.

5. The words of the Old Testament are important, but their importance must not be pressed to the point where the meaning which they were intended to convey is overlooked. Words are vehicles of meaning and not absolutes in themselves.
6. When the Old Testament mentions Jehovah or God, the passage may often be applied to Jesus Christ.
7. Modern versions may be used and should be used so long as: they are corrected from the original languages whenever the accuracy of an important point is involved.
8. The fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy may be found in one of four areas:
  - a. It may have been fulfilled during the time between its utterance and the coming of Jesus Christ.
  - b. It may have been fulfilled in the life and work of Jesus Christ.
  - c. It may be fulfilled at a time later than the earthly ministry of Jesus Christ.
  - d. Some prophecies have been only partially fulfilled either in Old Testament or New Testament times and await their final and complete fulfillment in the consummation of the Kingdom of God.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Joseph Addison. Isaiah. 2 Vols. New York: John Wiley, 1859.
- Alford, Henry. The New Testament for English Readers. Chicago: Moody Press, n. d.
- Beet, Joseph Agar. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1884.
- Berkhof, Louis. Principles of Biblical Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1952.
- Calvin, John. Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. trans. and ed. by John Owen. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1955.
- Clarke, Adam. The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Vol. II. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n. d.
- Delitzsch, Franz. Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886.
- Denney, James. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans in The Expositor's Greek New Testament. Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n. d.
- Ellis, E. Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.
- Farrar, Frederic W. History of Interpretation. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1886.
- Godet, F. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1883.
- Johnson, Franklin. The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896.
- Knox, John. "Romans", The Interpreter's Bible. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951.
- Luther, Martin. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954. trans. by J. Theodore Mueller.

- The Methodist Commentary on the New Testament. London: Charles H. Kelley, 1893.
- Moe, Olaf. The Apostle Paul: His Message and Doctrine. trans. by L. A. Vigness Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1954.
- Moule, H. C. G. The Epistle to the Romans. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1896.
- Olshausen, Hermann. Biblical Commentary of the New Testament. trans. by A. C. Kendrick. Vols. III & IV. New York: Sheldon & Company Publishers, 1864.
- Ramm, Bernard S. Protestant Biblical Interpretation. Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1950.
- Ramm, Bernard S. Protestant Biblical Interpretation. rev. ed. Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1956.
- Sanday, William and Headlam, Arthur C. The Epistle to the Romans. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1902.
- Terry, Milton S. Biblical Hermeneutics. rev. ed. New York: Eaton & Mains, 1890.
- Toy, Crawford Howell. Quotations in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.
- Wesley, John. Explanatory upon the New Testament. New York: Eaton & Mains, n. d.
- Williams, William G., An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Cincinnati: Jennings and Rye, 1902.